

REMARKS

Pending Claims

Claims 1, 3-11 and 13-21 have been amended. Claim 12 was canceled without prejudice or disclaimer in a prior amendment. Accordingly, claims 1-11 and 13-21 remain pending in this application.

Power of Attorney - Change of Correspondence Address

A Power of Attorney and Change of Correspondence Address was filed October 13, 2006. A check of the PAIR system shows that this paper was entered in the application file, but the correspondence address was not changed. Accordingly, as requested by this paper, please address all future correspondence in this case to the address associated with customer number 24956, namely:

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, PC
1800 Diagonal Road
Suite 370
Alexandria, VA 22314

Interview Summary

Applicant and his undersigned representatives would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the in-person interview conducted on February 13, 2007. During the interview, the differences between Applicant's invention and the prior art were discussed. While Applicant believes that the prior art of record in the case does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention, Applicant has

attempted to clarify the claims in this Amendment to more specifically set forth Applicant's invention in an understandable manner.

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,459,506 - hereafter "Hu") in view of Hamilton (U.S. Patent No. 6,462,842 - hereafter "Hamilton"). Claims 13-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ching (U.S. Patent No. 6,533,168 - hereafter "Ching"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for the following reasons.

Combination of Hu and Hamilton does not Suggest the Invention

The invention, as claimed in claim 1, is directed to an apparatus that categorizes and combines expense information obtained from scanned receipts to produce and display report information. The Hu reference, on the other hand, merely teaches scanning a document and preserving the scanned document in a computer as an image (see Hu, e.g., at col. 4, lines 7-18). Hu does not teach or suggest automatically processing the scanned image to collect and categorize expense information obtained from the scanned image, or combining this expense information with expense information obtained from other receipts to display report information. In other words, a feature of Applicant's claim 1, which is automatic obtaining,

categorizing and combining of the expense information contained in the scanned receipts to obtain report information, is not taught or suggested by the Hu reference.

The present invention is directed to extracting expense data from receipts of different types, categorizing the collected expense data into predetermined categories in combination with expense information obtained from other receipts, and thus producing report information for the predetermined categories. Hu, however, relates to a mobile scanner capable of scanning a material to obtain an image in a standard image format. Thus, Hu does not teach or suggest scanning receipts to obtain expense information from the scanned receipts, or categorizing, combining and displaying the extracted expense information as a report in the manner taught by the present invention.

Hamilton fails to make up for the shortcomings in Hu discussed above. Hamilton is directed to an apparatus, program and method of controlling a scanner for increasing data throughput, increasing available resolutions, and reducing aliasing (see Hamilton, e.g., col. 2, lines 47-50). Hamilton improves scanning time by including a data rate adjustment circuit that allows the scanner to match the average data transfer rate of an associated device to avoid restarts (see col. 2, lines 51-60). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Hamilton does not teach or suggest a software that automatically extracts, categorizes and combines information from scanned receipts to obtain report information. Hamilton neither discloses nor suggests obtaining expense information from the scanned data, or categorizing and

combining the expense information of scanned receipts with that obtained from other scanned receipts to produce and display report information, as set forth in Applicant's claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention, as claimed in independent claims 1, 13 and 18, cannot be obvious in light of the combination of Hu and Hamilton.

Ching does not Teach the Invention

Ching is directed to producing a receipt having printed thereon a machine-readable dataform pattern 108, such as a barcode (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 50-54). The dataform contains encoded transaction data regarding details of a corresponding transaction. A scanning device is able to read the dataform and obtain relevant transaction information about the prior transaction (col. 8, lines 13-17). In another aspect, the scanning device is able to scan the purchaser's handwritten notations in a designated area of the receipt and convert the scanned imagery to into text for storage as comments associated with the transaction. Thus, Ching requires a specialized receipt having a predetermined format, and Ching fails to teach or suggest a scanner able to scan various types of receipts as in the present invention. For example, under Applicant's invention, receipts of no predefined format are able to be scanned, such as grocery receipts, purchase receipts, credit card receipts or bank statements having different widths and thicknesses so that the position of the expense information on each receipt is not predetermined. Further

Ching fails to teach or suggest collecting expense information from scanned receipts, categorizing the expense information into predetermined categories, and combining the categorized information with that of other receipts to obtain and display report information. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 13 and 18 are patentable over Ching, whether taken singly or in combination with the other art of record. The remaining claims depend from these claims, are directed to additional patentable features of the invention, and are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35,061

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: February 15, 2007